Lesar

While shaving a few minutes ago, when I decided to record my reaction to the first 20% of Noyes' Legacy of Doubt, xx I thought of what I would be saying and wondered if what for me will be a moderate comment can be at ributed to the erosing of the years or the aching of the bones. I feel good, as often I do when tired from physical work, and yesterday I enjoyed five hours of taking out trash trees and battling honeysuckle and wild grapes that ruined a nice patch of spruce.

It is really because I was tired and the joints and muscles didn't want to work that I even started Noyes' book. Having gone over the preface, epilogue and acknowledgement I'd had too much. However, because I believe in all the flowers blooming, I decided to see if there is a case for this old Mafia theory, in any form, instead of doing other reading.

You may remember that when you offered to lend me the ms. two years ago I declined. This had no connection with Noyes, of whom I knew nothing except that he could not have had all the professed interest in the JFK offing or he'd have at least spoken to me, if not interviewed me, on one of my many trips tp L.A.

At its best this is a stupid book by an insensitive man who, if I were to make any guess at all, began, with the notion he could make a pot and when he learned otherwise just couldn't ~~and~~ or wouldn t stop. He is a man who applies no tests to his own work, asks no questions when he fears the answers and is so lacking in self-respect that he doesn't bother to hide these things. I do not believe it is possible for him to make a case in the remaining pages that can in any way overcome these intial observations, otherwise I'd not make them.

He is in every man an undependable man, so untrustworthy that when he says interesting things I do not believe they can be accepted.

I make my evaluations my own way. You may not agree with them. With Noyes they were easy.

His judgement and honesty can be measured by the Judge Byrne business. Remember credits to him? I then wondered over what. Here he actually praises him for his conduct of the Ellsberg case and for his behavior in it. Both ought be condemned. He also provides an unintended appraisal of Byrne in reporting that when USAtty in LA, and apparently on Noyes' word only, Byrne considered subpenaeing Carlso Marcello. If there was any basis other than a dislike for the name Noyes does not even suggest it.

How Noyes got into this is really all that is needed to judge him and his book. His account is that it all started with Bill Turner. He goes out of his way to lie about Turner, one of the few ways he could give him credentials: Turner is a prolific writer. He is, actually, a lazy and entirely unoriginal man whose writing is conspicuously unoriginal. For a full-time writer, Turner has produced remarkably little, irrespective of worth. Then he accredits him further with an offhand suggestion that Turner disagreed with Garrison. The <u>time</u> of Turner's comment was <u>after</u> Garrison had cast him out following what I did in N.O. in December 1968.

Noyes says that after he got the Z film from turned he had it "authenticated" by an unnamed outfit he says is the best. If one knowns anything at all about this, in general or in specifics, that is impossible. No reputable firm could have told Noyes what he represents. First of all, he represents this as the original Z, which I find incredible for any self-respecting reporter. None should believe that possible and any with any sense at all could have learned easily, especially one with the facilities of a TV station. Secondly, and aside from frames femoved, the original has gaps that are apparent because there was a time when Z was not shooting. Besides, if this was the Garrison copy, as I presume, the most casual examination shows it is a piece-together version made by LIFE for the purpose of being able to later identify it. I spotted this on first viewing in N.O. and this did not require my earlier work on the film. The color is a dead giveaway. If it were a better version, then I know of none that do not have frames missing and at more than one place, more than what I knew when I wrote WW, when I'd been able to see no copy of the movie.

Having made Turner into a respectable source, which he is not, Noyes then credits him with the tip to look into Braden and simultaneously complains that Garrison said nothing about Braden. The latter is quite false, but the case was too bad even for Garrison. Noyes brackets this with an attack on Garrison over Bradley. BUT, Garrison and Bradley <u>begin</u> with Turner. Turner and Boxley, as I recall the time of the threat against Garrison, which was before the King assassination. I can pinpoint the time. Nuff said on this?

Noyes is so insensitive, so hung up on himself, that he didn't even recognize the dry wit of the FBI agent who told him the story would make good fiction.

Okay, so Braden is Bradling, he is a liar and a crook and he has Mafia ties. He was in Dealey Plaza and he got busted. By itself, this means nothing. The land crawls with his likes and they were not rare in Dealey Plaza. If Noyes can go 20% of the way through his book without giving the slighest indication why Braden was an assassin, he can't have a reason to believe it he can trust himself. Not even if he is writing like a detective story, because the story itself needs credibility and that requires motive.

Noyes' version of Braden's arrest is an insight into more than Dallas cops and those many people picked up at the scene. It tells us all about Noyes.

First of all, there was no reasonable basis for the elevator-operator's behavior. He took Braden up long after the shooting. In fact, there is nothing in Noyes' account that suggests anything except that Braden could not have done the shooting. Unless he is one of Sprague's and Garrison's multitudinous paymasters in the Plaza, what other function could he have had at the scene of the crime?

So, Lummie was suspicious because Braden identified himself with a charge card and not his driver's license? Well, the cops had him and searched him. Why no further mention of this driver's license. He had one or he didn't, not reported by Noyes. If Braden had a fake license he could have flashed it with no more danger than flashing a credit card. If he had it under any other name, no special hazard in identifying himself from it. This parts simply doesn't stack and is badly over-written to try to give it totally absent meaning.

In short, in all these words, the entire first fifth of the book, there is not a single thing in any way relevant to the JFK assassination. Nor is there any single reason given that in any way justifies the belief that Braden could have had anything to do with it.

I was not unaware of his arrest. I am the only one to have written of it in any of the books. I would be interested in knowing if there was anything behind it. I then found no reason and to this point Noyes has not even suggested anything except what he does not say, that there were more precautions taken along the route than we had reason to believe. If the cops or anyone else alerted the elevator operators, that is more than the Report says.

With so intending, Noyes reports how little protection any citizen has from cops, at least California's. All a reporter whose good will is wanted need do is ask and he can have all the cops' information that can hurt anyone.

These observations are from recollection. I have not looked at the book in writing them.

I think they give you what you do not need, an evaluation of Bud, who went for this crap, and perhaps one of Bob, who is credited with helping Noyes. How anyone could have anything to do with him or his work after a glance at any version of this garbage I don't begin to see. And I presume that with the passing of time and editing and suggestions it is better than the form in which you had it. This work is so terrible that after reading it there was every reason to have nothing to do with Noyes.

And I say this without mention of the visible formula Noyes used for acceptability, an example being his entirely undocumented attack on Garrison. And more than mere defense of Bradley. It is one thing to defend the man, rotter than he is. It is quite another to profess any kind of dedication to him. When Noyes wrote this book, one of the keys to acceptability was attacking Garrison. So, he does. It is that simple. He makes no case. He doesn't even try. With Bradley, the case could be made easily, via court decisions. I think this tells us a little about Noyes. It is consistent with what I observed at the CTIA nut-harvest of 11/23-4. I could hardly restrain myself when he was off on that ego-trip through which I sat. Now I understand it much better.

I have not mentioned the dirty little tricks dirty writers can use. Noyes does, too.

Hastily,